

Desk

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

NOV 1 1953

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

SOCIAL CLIMATE AS A FACTOR IN EDUCATION

Special Issue

Dan W. Dodson

Issue Editor

Climate As a Vector in Growth and Development	
<i>Dan W. Dodson</i>	98
The Structure of Creativity	
<i>Jeanette Veatch</i>	102
Climate and Social Acceptability	
<i>Samuel I. Spector</i>	108
The Emotional Problems of Negro High School Youth Which Are Related to Segregation and Discrimination in a Southern Urban Community	
<i>Baker M. Hindman</i>	115
The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School	
<i>Howard S. Becker</i>	128
Editorial	98
Book Reviews	142

NOVEMBER 1953

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

PUBLISHED BY

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

157 WEST 13TH ST., NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

Editorial Staff

DAN W. DODSON, *Editor in Chief* JOHN C. PAYNE, *Asst. Managing Editor*
ABRAHAM I. KATSH, *Managing Editor*
GLADYS MARKIN, *Asst. Managing Editor*
EVELYN F. DODSON, *Business Manager*
HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, FREDERIC M. THRASHER, STEPHEN G. RICH
I. DAVID SATLOW, STEPHEN J. WRIGHT, ESTHER HILTON, ETHEL ALPENFELS,
Associate Editors.

Permanent Department

Book Reviews

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

Board of Trustees

MAURICE MOFFATT, <i>President</i>	DAN W. DODSON, <i>Managing Trustee</i>
W. CLINTON STUART, <i>Vice-President</i>	STEPHEN G. RICH
HENRY W. MEISSNER, <i>Secretary</i>	WILLIAM W. BRICKMAN
I. DAVID SATLOW, <i>Treasurer</i>	HERBERT D. HARPER

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is published by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc., monthly from September to May, inclusive. Publication and business office, 157 West 13th St., New York 11, N. Y. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; foreign rates, Canadian and South American, \$3.25, all others, \$3.40; the price of single copies is 35 cents each. Orders for less than half a year will be charged at the single-copy rate.

Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at the Post Office at Manchester, N. H., authorized January 16, 1950.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is indexed in *Educational Index*, *Public Affairs Information Service*, and *Business Education Index*.

The publishers of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY are not responsible for the views held by its contributors.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

r
r
r
r
i
s,

e

al
n
is
;
e

w
at

ic

le

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

Vol. 27

Nov. 1953

No. 3

DESEGREGATING EDUCATION (An Editorial)

One of the leading concerns of education today is the impending decision of the Supreme Court on the question as to whether segregated education can be equal education. Law as a directive force in American life is a much disputed issue. It would be wonderful if the barristers and the sociologists could spell out for the public what are the metes and bounds of this instrumentality. To the present, however, there are few guideposts. During the past two decades, however, there has been considerable reinterpretation of law so that it is looked upon as a much more dynamic institution than before.

If the decision should wipe out the time honored "Plessy vs. Ferguson" decision and remove the legal barriers to integration, there would undoubtedly be created a situation fraught with the greatest challenges and at the same time the greatest dangers of any which has faced public education in its history. Some state governments claim they would abolish public education. Some persons believe there would be a great swing to private schools. Some think there would be a pressure to segregate community life more rigidly.

Whatever the decision, it is clear that in almost every community there is going to be uncertainty, tension and in some places open conflict unless there is mobilized immediately all the resources at the disposal of the community to create a climate of mutual goodwill and trust. Every agency is going to be put on the spot. They are going to have to face the issues in the proverbial "fish or cut bait" fashion.

Educators would do well not to stick their heads in the sand and wait until the decision comes, but instead take this golden opportunity to seize the initiative and get a small group of representative people together and start them thinking about the import of the decision, be it *pro* or *con*. Most communities will want to abide by the decisions of the law. They will want to do it in such fashion as to hold conflict to a minimum. It can not be done if action is postponed until the decision is announced.

Dan W. Dodson

Copyright 1953, by the Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc.

CLIMATE VECTORS IN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Dan W. Dodson

As the objective of education has come to be interpreted more in terms of growth and development and less in terms of "learning," the total climate or atmosphere in which growth and development take place becomes increasingly significant. The consideration of climate or atmosphere has been hinted at in many different ways in the past. Kurt Lewin's concept of "field of forces"¹ is one such frame of reference in which the impact of the total impingements on behavior is described. His study with Lippitt and White on placing children in democratic, authoritarian and *laissez faire* climates has become almost a landmark in highlighting the impact of climate as a determinant of the direction which growth takes.

Roethlisberger and his associates in the Hawthorne experiment indicated the significance of climate in industrial production. Prior to these analyses, many sociologists attempted to describe this impact with such concepts as "definition of the total situation,"² "the cultural milieu in which and through which the child organizes his experience."³ The limitations of these past concepts were more those of an adequate learning theory than were they limitations of insight into the phenomena. In other words, the vague groping toward the total climate or atmosphere was valid as a sociological insight.

The objective of education, however, was conceived to be an individualistic interpretation of a specific behavior or the learning of fragmented materials. The objectives of education were not conceived to be those of growth and development.

Casual observation, of course, confirms the point being treated here. It is not uncommon, for instance, that middle class mothers in their anxiety to get their children to eat, create atmosphere in which the children learn exactly the opposite of what the mother is attempting to teach them. This problem is so extensive that malnutrition today is almost as much a middle class problem as it is a problem of adequate diets for lower class groups.

Another illustration comes from an observation made by a guidance person on a southern university campus. His statement was

¹Lewin, Kurt, *Resolving Social Conflicts*.

²Thrasher, F.M. *The Journal of Educational Sociology*.

³Payne, E. Geo. *Readings in Educational Sociology*.

that a large portion of the white students who rebel against southern mores in Negro-white relations tend to be young people who have rejected their parents and identified the race prejudice of the South with their parents. Thus the way in which the parents relate to their children teaches more than what is attempted in the transmission of cherished family traditions.

These commonplace observations represent the heart of the problem of growth and development. It operates at many levels. The most intimate, of course, is that of parent-child relations. The next perhaps involves sibling relations. (In spite of the family pressures toward siblings' acceptance of each other and love for each other, the climate of family life frequently creates personality traumas that continue throughout life.) Beyond these intimate relationships are those, of course, of play groups, school and the wider community.

As illusory as climate is, it must be recognized as one of the great dynamics in growth and development.

The assessment of climate is, of course, a research problem yet to be solved. It is nebulous but none the less dynamic. Wrightstone has developed a scale which has been rather useful in assessing classroom climate. Classrooms obviously are only a minute part of the total situation in which an individual operates day by day. By the same token, it is this illusory factor which has beclouded the major portion of experimental research done within the past decade. It is next to impossible to do an experimental research and hold constant the very thing that the Hawthorne experiment discovered, namely, that as you involve the experimental group in an undertaking, you immediately change the whole climate of the experiment because the morale of the group is changed by their very incorporation into a new project where they feel that they are part of something significant and where the "being in on something" cannot be discounted as a part of the climate.

With this point in mind several students at the Center for Human Relations Studies focussed their studies toward an examination of this general problem. James Dysart⁴ used the Wrightstone scale to examine the climate of classrooms of teachers before and after they had been trained in the use of group dynamics. These observations revealed a tremendous improvement in the climate of the classrooms as a result of this kind of experience. No attempt was made to meas-

⁴Dysart, James, *A Study of The Effect of An In-Service Course in Sociometry and Sociodrama on Teacher-Pupil Rapport and Social Climate in the Classroom*, unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, New York University, 1951.

ure the growth of children in this climate, but it did demonstrate that teachers could be taught the skills by which climate is improved.

The Veatch⁵ study was an attempt to discover what happened to growth and development of young people when teachers were taught skills in the use of creative activities. These included unstructured dramatics, creative writing and discussion. The amazing part of the study was not in the findings relating to group acceptance or rejection on the part of the children, but rather in the fact that in a basic skill subject such as reading there was growth and development on the part of the children which was almost beyond belief. The significance of the study seems to be saying: when you create climate conducive to growth and development, the fundamental skills almost develop of themselves and in any instance are secondary and not primary to what is the main objective of education.

The Spector⁶ study indicates that where the skills of climate creation are utilized, where interaction is consciously fostered so that those in the classes are caught up in this thing called group process, not only is there an increase in acceptance of young people of each other, but that which is equally important, the "social expansiveness" of the individual is increased. This process dimension of education is perhaps where most teachers fall shortest of the mark as professional people. Their competencies at leadership are for the most part developed in their interactions with youngsters of comparable socioeconomic status. It is possible for them to hide their limitations in leading groups of their own middle class background, because middle class children tend to be motivated by goals which do not depend so much on "process." When they are called on to provide leadership across ethnic lines and social class, their limitations become painfully apparent.

This study seems to demonstrate techniques by which the average teacher in the average classroom of the average school can create climate in which these other dimensions of growth and development which relate to group acceptance may occur without loss of academic standards.

The study by Hindman⁷ demonstrates another aspect of the problem of climate. It documents in dramatic fashion the fact that children learn what they live in community rather than what they are taught in school. These seniors, products of an outstanding school

⁵Veatch, Jeanette, Page 102.

⁶Spector, Samuel, Page 108.

⁷Hindman, Baker, Page 115.

system, not only have developed pre-judgments and hostilities toward their fellow citizens of another race, but, as well, in many instances, have learned the opposite of what almost every teacher they ever had has taught with regard to their relations with other races. They have learned how, through techniques approaching passive resistance, to protest a second class citizenship status in subtle ways.

The article by Becker⁸ demonstrates another dimension of the problem we are here discussing, namely, the status of the teacher in the authoritarian system. It has been this writer's experience that the ambivalence concerning authoritarian roles is tied to the problem of climate in which professional leadership is called upon to function. An hypothesis could be documented to a considerable degree which would say that irrespective of how well trained a staff may be, if the administrator is insecure in his relationship to community, he tends to become rigid and authoritarian in his relation to his staff, that he thereby transmits his insecurity to them. Hence, freedom and permissiveness as a climate in which growth and development should occur tend to be replaced by formalism.

It is hoped that this number of the *Journal* will be a stimulus to further research and investigation in this area. If, as we believe, personality is a totality, and if we accept the concept that growth and development are the objective of all our purposive efforts, then beginning with the climate of community life and extending to the relationship of teacher to classroom, this factor of climate becomes tremendously important. It bids fair to reverse the trend toward fragmentation of learning. It places in perspective the importance of each agency in the community to the whole of the climate created by their total efforts and places skills in the development of climate on a par with the erudition which is supposed to be the stock in trade of the educational expert.

⁸Becker, Howard, Page 128. Done at the University of Chicago.

Professor Dan W. Dodson is Director of Curriculum and Research of the Center for Human Relations Studies, New York University.

THE STRUCTURE OF CREATIVITY

Jeannette Veatch

Since Lewin and his co-workers made their great contribution to our thinking with their explorations of authoritarian, laissez-faire, and democratic structure, it has become more and more important that such illumination be continued. Particularly is this true of laissez-faire and democratic patterns, as these are most commonly misunderstood, most commonly confused, and most commonly equated. Laissez-faire, which is literally translated as "allow to act" is, it seems to me, synonymous with permissiveness which is an oft-used term among modern educators. The equation of permissiveness and democracy, the feeling that a laissez faire climate is a democratic one is an incorrect and highly damaging assumption. The sources of this confusion are manifold, but it would seem that the main source of trouble comes from the well-advertised idea that democratic behavior is FREE behavior. Syllogistic thinking then produces the notion that whatever is *free*, is ipso facto, democratic. Such is most certainly not always the case. The difference between laissez-faire action and democratic action is that the latter has form, structure, and organization that are necessary to its existence. Laissez-faire, by its very translation, indicates no form, no structure, no organization — only anarchic amorphousness.

To say that democracy has structure and organization is not to say that it has rigidity or inflexibility. Structure CAN be flexible. But it is to say that certain aspects of its nature *must be present*, or democratic action simply does not occur. The shift of one characteristic can well throw what is intended to be democratic action into a quite different behavior, either authoritarianism, or laissez faire.

For example, let us take a group of children singing together with an adult. One aspect of democratic behavior is that of voluntary effort. If each child wants to work together with the adult to produce beautiful music; and each session is by mutual consent of the group AND the adult, then the structure for each such session is democratic. But if for one session the adult *coerces* participation and so is not voluntary, the structure changes immediately from democratic to authoritarian.

The understanding of these intricate, and often obtuse, differences lends itself to the understanding of a classroom climate which promotes those ideals with which America is most concerned. However,

as teachers clarify their thinking and classroom practices, they begin to see that that which is democratic is almost invariably creative. The equation of democracy and creativity does seem to be synonymous, and the activities which are creative have analogous aspects to democratic activities.

It is interesting to note that this is not a new idea. Gordon Childe¹ shows that the development of creative and inventive man, since the beginning of recorded history, was in direct proportion to decreasing authoritarian controls of a given society. Before 3000 B. C. societies relatively free from god-king dominations where artisans could work for the society rather than the expansion of the god-king control, 16 major inventions were discovered, such as, the wheel, the arch, the sailboat, fermentation, artificial irrigation, the plow, and others. After 3000 B.C. (til 1000 B.C.) invention and discovery withered under the impact of the urban revolution. The artisans were used by their masters to further the latter's power, and the number of major discoveries took a sharp drop from 16 to 4, and even two of those came from an isolated society *not* so subject to its own authoritarian controls.

This matter of democracy and creativity is dependent upon, then, the absence of authoritarianism. But to make such a statement is of little help, because such a statement covers everything and clarifies little.

For the classroom, as for society, the analysis of the creative and democratic climate is an aid to its development and promotion. As has been said, if the basic elements of such a climate are omitted, that climate changes to something other than creative or democratic. These elements, then, are the characteristics of creativity. They lend it personality, its unique structure and organization. By these elements is it to be known.

Eliot Dole Hutchinson² has studied the writings of great men and women as they describe their creative moments. He believes the creative cycle to be:

1. Period of preparation, trial and error activity.
2. Period of renunciation of problem in which effort is temporarily abandoned, with the individual shifting into another activity.
3. Moment (or period) of insight.

¹*Man Makes Himself*, Chapter IX—Mentor Books, reprint 1946, New York.

²p. 422, *A Study of Interpersonal Relations*, editor, Patrick Mullahy Hermitage Press, New York, 1949.

4. Period of verification, elaboration, and evaluation.

However adequate this analysis may be, it must be weighed as a study of reactions of individuals, and gifted individuals at that. Hutchinson, as well as others who have written on the subject, are not concerned with the promotion of creativity within the average man, although all would undoubtedly be delighted at such a development. The cycle quoted above may well apply to ANY person, old or young, but it examines *what seems to happen*. Regardless of the importance of that, it is of even greater importance to examine *what kind of climate produces* creative behavior.

The educationist must be concerned with the optimum development of all men, as the responsibility of school teaching must be held accountable to all men. It is in the school that all men, at some time or other, are to be found.

To this end, the characteristics of creative activity *in a school-room* must be examined. Such exploration must be based not only upon theoretical grounds, but upon research that is available. The writer has completed a study that works in the direction of illuminating the area of creative activity in the classroom. Teachers of eight experimental groups in the eleventh year of age were trained to conduct creative activities in dramatics, writing, and discussion. Their training was based on certain elements which were assumed to be creative in character. While these elements were adapted particularly to school room situations, nevertheless, it is believed that they have a universality which is applicable in almost any situation. They are as follows:

1. The teacher must allow the choice of participation to lie with the children. Pressure or coercion for participation decreases creative behavior.
2. The right of participation also involves the right of privacy. The child, alone, chooses whether or not to unveil his products or talents to others. Coercion alters creative behavior to something else.
3. Rewards for participation in the activity are unnecessary and can be destructive of the creativity. Its very existence is enough reward, and its lack of existence is enough punishment.
4. All end products must be unique with the producer, and the teacher must foster such individuality or uniqueness of product.
5. The group climate, during all or part of the activity, is un-

mistakably exciting, adventuresome, and literally productive of glandular changes affecting heart beat and breathing.

6. The teacher, as the status person, must use that status to promote the effective consideration of group desires, including his own, without destroying the freedom of participation (See # 1)
7. The teacher must reflect his own attitude of welcome to all end products without destructive or critical comment, favorable or unfavorable.
8. All products are to be welcomed by all, and the discussion of their quality be divorced from the producer's personality.
9. As valuable end-products or valuable talents become apparent, leadership shifts from one personality to another in recognition of the value of products or talents.
10. Sharing and cooperation are integral to the activity. Individual competitiveness is denied. Talented individuals develop for the good of the whole group, and are not envied, but admired as the prototype of the whole galaxy of individuals.

Operating on these foundations, the experimental teachers were coached to carry out the three creative activities. The comparison groups, of course, were unaware of the experimentation. For the purposes of this paper, however, the unfamiliar character of these activities might hamper an understanding of what took place. It would be well, therefore, to describe the experimentation, and to show how the ten elements of creative activity expressed themselves in action.

Creative dramatics were those in which the children and teacher together agreed upon a story, or other material, and proceed to act it out without memorizing lines or otherwise rigidifying the action so that the same words and phrases appear upon repetition of the action. The emergence of the creative elements can be seen when it is known that no child acted a character unless he volunteered. (# 1 and # 2, page 4). No grades, no withholding of privileges were allowed. (# 3). No child acted any character the same way, even if two children portrayed the same character. (# 4). The groups clamored to be held spellbound, and requested repeats of spellbinding bits. (# 5 and # 9). The material used was a group (not forgetting the teacher) choice. (# 6). Evaluations were in terms of what was liked, and what was unique and individual, and critical comments were directed at the *character's* name rather than

he who portrayed that character. (# 8, 10, and 4). These are a few of the ways in which this activity was helped to be creative. It might be pointed out, in reference to an earlier statement, that the similarity between democracy and creativity is most obvious.

To proceed to the second activity, let us examine creative writing. This was a practice in which children were helped to write down what they chose without such writings being subject to correction. As in dramatics, the basic elements of creative behavior were maintained as follows: No child wrote or revealed what he wrote unless he chose to do so. (# 1 and # 2). His paper was never marked or graded, and punishment was felt if a child was not allowed to write when the writing period came. (# 3). Each child was continually urged to "say it in his own way", and so be helped to have a unique product. (# 4). Teachers were helped to develop ways of setting a "mood" or an atmosphere which was conducive to the development of exciting thoughts or ideas. (# 5, # 6). All efforts that were offered for sharing were welcome, and evaluative comments dwelt upon the writing rather than upon the child who wrote. (# 7, # 8). In this activity time the sharing time was especially enjoyed, and talents were recognized in individuals who previously seemed untalented. (# 9, # 10). Thus in these and other more detailed ways was this activity founded upon the basic elements of creative behavior.

The last of the three experimental practices was discussion, which operated so that a panel or circle could cross-fire on subjects of their own choosing without the teacher being necessary. The actions which were basically creative are: No child talked unless he wished, and no one including teacher dictated a topic to any one else. (# 1 and # 2). Not only were no grades or marks given, but being left out of the discussion was frequently bitter punishment for an individual child. (# 3). The chairman or the group insisted that ideas not be repeated, and the child who talked in an uninteresting fashion lost his audience in an unmistakable manner. (# 4 and # 5). The teacher at the outset helped children to be trained to take over chairmanship responsibilities. She helped children to see how the rules could be set that would *allow* freedom of participation. For example, not talking when someone else was talking, or taking turns when several wanted to talk at the same time. (# 6). All children's contributions were welcomed, but dull and uninteresting ideas were evaluated after the discussion was closed and then done in terms of helping the child to choose more wisely for his next discussion topic.

The loss of audience, even if polite, is powerful in its effect upon unique and valuable end-products. (# 8, # 9, and # 10).

In these ways the teachers of some 300 children fostered creativity in their classrooms. Some scheduling was necessary and the minimum of time spent on these activities was five hours a week; one hour for writing and dramatics and three hours a week for discussion. It was interesting to note that 1) all children produced something MOST of the time; 2) all children that produced did so on schedule (as well as off schedule) although the groups usually planned the "when" of the scheduling; 3) all teachers were able to call forth some creative action at one time or another in all children. This latter point is of major importance if we are to believe that creativity is not the sole property of the talented and gifted genii of the world.

The hypothesis of the study was that children who participated in creative activities would 1) like each other better, 2) be better adjusted emotionally, and 3) increase their academic achievement to a greater degree than those groups with whom they were compared. This hypothesis was substantiated in part. With no emphasis upon the formal teaching of reading whatever, the experimental groups outgained the comparison groups in reading achievement by an almost double score (9.5 months to 5.8 months) at a statistical significance of less than 1%. However, there was no comparable improvement in the area of arithmetic achievement. The instruments of measurement for social acceptance and emotional needs adjustment proved inconclusive, as the former were at sharp variance with the observational data, and the latter showed low reliability. A four months experimental period seemed adequate in some respects, but the lack of firm results in two categories might indicate that longer periods might be more productive.

The point of the whole study is: How does this relate to our knowledge of creativity and democracy? Perhaps its greatest contribution lies in the area of the defense of the democratic ideal in the classroom. But surely, these activities did not just happen accidentally. Teachers had to be trained to carry them out. Help had to be available continually to improve the creative action. If for no other reason, then, could it not be said that creativity has its structure which can be seen, found, taught, and passed on. Of what greater value can a study be?

Dr. Jeanette Veatch is in the division of Field Services and Elementary Education Department in the School of Education, New York University.

CLIMATE AND SOCIAL ACCEPTABILITY

Samuel I. Spector

The climate in a classroom may be understood to be the rapport that exists between the pupils and the teacher. If the former feel at ease with the latter, the possibilities for growth and development are greater. In contrast is the authoritarian atmosphere in which the pupils remain passive and non-participant in the teaching process. Another factor essential to climate is the relationship that exists between the teacher and the pupils. This presumes on the part of the former a genuine affection for children and a willingness to permit to them active participation in the planning and effecting of their education, along with much opportunity for self discipline and government. The third aspect is the cohesiveness that exists among the children themselves. If the children are non-social and antagonistic, progress is difficult despite the presence of teacher-pupil mutual good will. Thus classroom climate becomes a three dimensional matter, involving relationships that obtain between pupils and teachers; between teachers and pupils; and between pupils and pupils. It is with the last of these dimensions that this paper is concerned.

In a five month-thirty session experiment, connected with a doctoral thesis, the attempt was made to change the social acceptability of a class of 31 children by means of certain group techniques, a concomitant of which was the effort to establish a favorable climate. The class involved was an eighth grade one in one of New York City's public schools. It contained sixteen boys and fifteen girls, of whom only one was Negro and only three non-Jewish. There was no retardation. The average I.Q. was 109.2 and the average mark earned in major subjects (English, mathematics and social studies) was 73.5. Most of the children came from the upper and lower middle class strata. Their average age was thirteen years. Twenty one of them showed good health as measured by the height and weight scores of the Wetzell Grid. There was a great preponderance of only two siblings to each family, while approximately half of the children were either oldest or youngest children. About half of the parents had a high school education. Eighteen in the class indicated membership in a group outside of school, and only five claimed the possession of exhibitory skills that might keep them in the

public eye. Finally, in terms of age, I.Q., reading scores and index, and arithmetic scores and index, the pupils of this class were representative of 23,000 peers who people other eighth grade classes in the public schools of New York City. These data are presented so that the reader may compare his population to the one described and adapt his own applications of the techniques accordingly.

The extent to which members of the class were accepted by their fellow students was determined by the application of the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale. This instrument is based on a continuum of acceptability ranging from "very, very best friends" to "dislike them". Children were asked to ascribe one of the six categories in the continuum to their classmates. In terms of choices boys made of girls and the converse, the class showed an average of 49.6 points, which fell in the 34 percentile range. Fully twenty five percent of the class assigned the #4 category (don't know them) to their peers. This extremely large area of neutrality was greatly affected by the experiment. Approximately fourteen per cent of the children were poorly-chosen and rejected. These statistics indicate that there was little cohesiveness and unsatisfactory pupil to pupil relationship. The challenge they provoked was two-fold: a better pupil to pupil climate needed to be established; in this improved climate, the attempt would be made to increase social acceptability.

The writer is the guidance teacher in the school in which the experiment was conducted. He taught the experimental class both guidance and English for ten periods every week. As in all schools, the reputation of established teachers is handed down from pupil to pupil. Since it was favorable in the investigator's instance, it made the establishment of pupil-teacher rapport much easier. The children felt no fear or tension when entering his room. Later, exposure to sincerity, respect, good humor, relaxed feeling and justice on the part of the teacher cemented the rapport between the children and himself. Long and varied experience has convinced the writer that pupil to pupil relationships cannot be improved until pupil-teacher and teacher-pupil accord is reached. With the achievement of these two aspects of climate, the experimenter sought to improve the pupil to pupil phase. It was felt that improvement in climate and sociability could be effected by promoting the feeling of security and belongingness

among the children. The techniques that were used are described in the following paragraphs.

In the attempt to provide more security the teacher sought to efface himself as much as possible. For the most part, he sat in the back of the room, taking notes. He strove to remove himself as a symbol of authority. The fact that the children felt free to criticize the suggestions made by him indicated that his presence was not considered a threat to their freedom.

To this was added permissiveness. No guidance or limitation was imposed. Noise and confusion were permitted as long as they did not disturb the other classes on the floor. Self and group disciplining were left to the session and group chairmen. The pupils did their own planning, discussing, creating, deciding and role playing for the class "how-to-become-popular" play that they were constructing.

Free interaction also helped to provide a greater feeling of security. Restriction was kept to a minimum. The children mingled freely with each other, with laughter and good spirit. There was socialization at every session, aided by free movement within the confines of the room. A class party, with the exchange of gifts, was a culminating activity. The isolates, too, were drawn into the socialization.

Knowledge of the purpose of the experiment made for greater security. From the outset the children were informed of the nature of the experiment. Though this procedure may seem to have been rash, it is in consonance with the maturity of junior high school teen agers and with modern educational practices that encourage joint teacher-pupil purposeful planning. It seemed also that the children would more readily cooperate if they knew what they were doing. As the experiment progressed, every step was explained and no questions were left unanswered. This frankness also strengthened the good rapport between the children and the investigator.

A key step was the establishment of intrinsic motivation and consequently more security. It was believed that the individual feels more secure when he is doing something that he has initiated or has decided to accept. In the experiment, the class received, debated upon and accepted the proposal by the investigator that it produce a play dealing with popularity. The fact that this motivation was successful is evidenced by its cogency for more than twenty five sessions and by the fewness of com-

plaints about the repetitiveness and monotony of the practice on the skits.

Another technique used to promote security was the warming-up periods. They served to establish a more congenial and friendly atmosphere as a prelude to actual committee work. They helped relax the children and give them the greater security that play situations provide. Among the methods used were the conversation game in which children in parallel seats of adjacent rows faced each other and for one minute discussed given topics. The individuals in one of the rows moved backward for each discussion so as to make contact with a different child each time. There was also the group warm-up in which the children, divided into groups of four in succession, simultaneously sang the same song, sang different songs, played Twenty Questions, played an active game called Pass the Eraser and chanted original cheers. The class as a whole enjoyed playing Twenty Questions and each group presented a five minute entertainment which comprised riddles, charades and facsimiles of popular current television quizzes.

The graduation of the new approaches involved in the construction of the play and the mastery of these steps helped to strengthen the feeling of security. This was implemented in the introduction, warming-up process, discussion of facets involved, consideration of how to effectuate the items in the facets, preliminary skit construction, evaluation of these skits, continued writing of the skits, reading of the skits to the class, making of the necessary revisions and finally role playing or enacting. There was a gradual change in the population and size of the groups. Both the warming-up process and evaluation techniques went from the individual to the group.

The opportunity for leadership often promotes a sense of security in that it bestows temporary power and authority, provides a limelight, and helps to diminish shyness. Every child in the experimental class had the opportunity to preside at a full class session. The groups elected their own chairmen. All chairmen were briefed shortly and were made responsible for both discipline and accomplishment. The isolates and low-acceptability children did as well as the others. Many of the children showed pleasure in their chairmanship roles.

A valuable tool for forging security was continued evaluation. The last five minutes of each session were devoted to this activity. In addition, two different recorders, in their minutes of each

session, made evaluations. Evaluation proved valuable because it helped the children to accept weaknesses and failure. It served to promote objectivity and to lessen personal bias. The evaluators developed some insight into good group activity (the offering and receiving of criticism) and the need for active participation therein.

The class discussion of qualities of social acceptability encouraged the feeling of security. Many of the children realized that the elements that made for popularity were within their reach, in terms of understanding and implementation. In translating these concepts into action, they unconsciously adopted some of them into their own behavior. This was especially evident in the conduct of the session chairmen, who tried to avoid giving the floor to friends only.

Role playing, which in the experiment, consisted of acting a part in a skit, occupied the last nine sessions. It made for security in that each child had a role to play and knew that he would not be judged for his ability. Whether he was fit for the role or whether the role approximated his own personality was not too important. The idea was that each child played with sincerity a role that might appear in practical situations. The content of the skit may have had some effect on him; and the lack of criticism of his acting definitely diminished his tension.

To foster the feeling of belonging a series of techniques was employed. One of these was the *gradual* increase in the size of the groups. It was felt that getting the children accustomed to work with each other gradually would provide an interplay of mutual activity in which they would develop a feeling of belonging. Accordingly different sized groups were set up. They ranged from two-person committees assigned to discuss and report on facets of social acceptability, to three-person units who wrote preliminary scripts embodying the facets, to four-person groups who improved the skits, and finally to permanent five-member committees who completed and enacted the final skits. It was felt that the creation of larger groups would result in unwieldiness.

The rotation of group membership was perhaps the most significant approach. The preliminary measurements showed that fully one-fourth of the children did not know each other. Observation quickly established the fact that the low-acceptability children found difficulty in working with each other, and would

have to be placed with more popular children to enable them to feel that they too belonged. The rotation of the children was arbitrary since it was felt that, if sociometric choices were made, too much time would be diverted from more important activities and unpopular children would never be included. Therefore the children were paired for one session, and then redesignated for another. When they were divided into threes, the basis of home proximity was used, for the groups were instructed to meet in each other's homes. The foursomes were chosen by one of the session chairmen. The permanent grouping of five, occurring half-way in the experiment, was obtained by a sociometric measure in reverse. On the basis of children's choices as to whom they would want on their permanent committees, the writer constituted groups that consisted of individuals with the most to the least degree of popularity. Thus the hardly-known and less popular children were sure to be included in some group.

The group milieu seems to be best for promoting a sense of belonging. In the experiment a number of group activities were used, for the most part simultaneously. Thus the children, themselves, suggested that working in groups would help increase popularity. Accordingly, they planned, along with the investigator, the program as it proceeded from the initial discussions to the final enactment of the play. They created and reported on skits involving such acceptability facets as being a good leader, being a good sport, developing a good manner, developing a personal skill, developing a sense of humor and being friendly. When they participated in group discussion, they felt that they were a part of a whole and in joint activity with the other speakers and the audience. There was discussion on group process, administrative procedures, and the content of the skits, along with questioning and clarification. In the making of group decisions, prestige was added even to the most unpopular child, for he was able to cast his vote along with his peers and to feel a sense of belonging in that he helped make class decision. There were more than twenty acts of such decision that ranged from deciding to rotate chairmen of sessions to the use of a quiz as a warmer-up. Group evaluation involved joint activity, recognition of the individual by the chairman and others, and the development of impartial, impersonal and constructive criticism. Here occurred an evaluation by the class that the conversation game and the warm-up periods made for more friendliness and

better knowledge of each other. Or, there was the evaluation of the efficiency of session and group chairmen. At one point, one group was asked to evaluate the skit of another group. Then the individual was asked to evaluate his own participation in and contribution to the experiment as a whole. In all, it seemed that these efforts to promote the feeling of belongingness along with the simultaneous attempts to engender a feeling of security, in a frame work of a definite long-term activity, made for a climate that promoted an increase in social acceptability.

What were the results of all of this activity? A second administration of the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale indicated on the part of the experimental class a gain of 46% in acceptability. The number 4 category (don't know) was reduced by 57%. Twenty-nine of the thirty one children made gains ranging from 3 to 76 points. During the course of the experiment, the average contact gain made by each child was 11.4 classmates. On a self-evaluation questionnaire, in response to the question as to whether the experiment helped the pupils to like classmates with whom they didn't bother before, twenty-seven answered in the affirmative. In interviews, children who gained most in acceptability for the most part assigned the experiment as the reason for their more favored status. Finally, the five children with the lowest acceptability made a gain of 75%; a similar group of median acceptability pupils gained 48%; while the five most popular individuals added 33% to their popularity.

The experiment seems to have made this clear. It was increasingly evident that climate and sociability were building up together, and that all three phases of climate (pupil-teacher, teacher-pupil, pupil-pupil) were inseparably interwoven. And, further, the success of the experiment was proof that security and belongingness made for a climate that aided the growth and development of social acceptability by serving as a motivating force, as a concomitant activity and as an end result.

Dr. Samuel I. Spector is a teacher in the Junior High School Division of the New York City Schools.

THE EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH WHICH ARE RELATED TO SEGREGATION AND DISCRIMINATION IN A SOUTHERN URBAN COMMUNITY

Baker M. Hindman

Much has been written and several studies have been made, which indicate that Negroes acquire, while growing up, some deep-seated prejudices and intense feelings of frustration, resentment, or withdrawal, particularly in those geographical areas where legal segregation is practiced against Negroes. Several works of fiction, some of which have been on the "best seller" lists, have been based on such emotional problems of Negro adolescents.

It seems to have been assumed by most of these writers and investigators that the prejudices and anti-social feelings of Negro youth result from actual experience with segregation and discrimination. Although this is a reasonable assumption, probably experientially derived by the writers in some instances, there is an obvious lack of systematic, organized evidence in the literature to support the assumption.

This study was made, therefore, to investigate the nature of the relationship between experiences involving contact with members of the white race and feelings of hostility or resentment, or other emotionalized attitudes, of a group of Negro high school youth. It explores several dimensions of the attitudes of these youth regarding problems of segregation and discrimination.

The study was conducted in the Negro high schools of Dade County (Miami), Florida. In this area, Negroes comprise approximately seventeen per cent of the total population, and also of the school enrollment. The population of the study consisted of the eleventh grade of these high schools in the spring semester of 1953.

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

In the investigation of this problem it was necessary to make certain assumptions. The question naturally arises in this study, as in any other, involving attitudes and feelings, "Are the respondents telling the truth?" There was no possible way in which

this question could be answered with certainty in this investigation. Although every possible effort was made to establish rapport with the subjects, and to assure them of the inviolability of the anonymity of their responses, it is quite possible, and even probable, that there existed emotional blocks, within the minds of some subjects, which inhibited completely truthful responses. However, it was assumed that the subjects' responses to the questions regarding their experiences and feelings do, in the long run, reveal significant information regarding their feelings and experiential backgrounds, whether they are completely truthful or not.

It was also assumed that the subjects, in listing the three changes which they would make in the social and civic life of the community if they had the power to do so were inclined to enumerate those phases of social and civic life which are most meaningful to them. Although the validity of this assumption can not be established, it seems reasonable to expect that each subject, in listing *three* such problems, would include the *one* which he considered most important.

A third assumption was essential to the study; viz., that Negro youth are at various stages of race consciousness and that this would affect the results. Obviously, a Negro youth who has had a considerable amount of experience in inter-racial contacts is likely to be more aware of the problems involved in race relations than one who has been shielded from such contacts. Furthermore, the youth have doubtlessly absorbed from their parents, siblings, and associates, varying degrees of group identification and race pride, or of group rejection and self-hatred. At one extreme there is likely to be a tendency for some subjects to reject their racial status, to have a desire to be white or to envy individuals with lighter complexion. At the other end of the scale may be found an extremely chauvinistic attitude toward race. Obviously, individuals at various stages of race consciousness might be expected to have quite different feelings and to respond in quite different ways to questions regarding inter-racial experiences and attitudes. It is even likely that some individuals may have possessed an ambivalence of these drives and that they would respond in different ways at different times. No attempt was made in this study, however, to identify these differences or the factors which produce them. It was assumed that, in the over-all results, these differences have, for all prac-

tical purposes, cancelled each other out, so that a fairly accurate picture of the relationships is obtained.

It was also necessary to recognize the following limitation of the study. There may be types of activities in which the Negro youth have had no experience because they have been barred from them by law or by the social mores of the community. They may therefore not have had any feelings concerning these areas, merely because of lack of knowledge of them. It is also possible that some experiences have been so bitter that the youth have suppressed them in their conscious memories, or some that were so embarrassing that they may have been too reticent to record them. Such experiences and feelings may not have been reported.

PROCEDURES

After careful consideration of many factors involved, including the racial difference between the investigator and the subjects, it was decided that an open-end, anonymous questionnaire, administered by Negro social studies teachers, would best serve the purposes of the investigation. A tentative form of such a questionnaire was developed through a pilot study, and revised as the result of a try-out in a class in Human Relations in Booker T. Washington High School of Miami. In its final form, the questionnaire consisted of four parts, described below.

Anonymity of responses was meticulously preserved and the subjects were assured that this would be done. This seemed essential to the purposes of the study. It is probable that many of these high school youth would have been reticent about recording their true feelings in response to the questions, if they thought that there was any likelihood that their replies could be associated with them as individuals. However, in order that the responses to the various parts of the questionnaire from each subject could be matched, with each other, and with other information regarding the student, each part was coded through a number assigned by the teacher. This coding, and the reasons for it, was carefully explained to the subjects. They were assured that, although the teacher would see their code number and their names, and the investigator would see their numbers and their responses, no one would see their names *and* their answers.

Tests were made of the validity and reliability of the responses. Space, however, does not permit the presentation of a description of these tests here. It was found that the instrument

was reasonably valid and reliable for the purposes of this study.

PROBLEM AREAS

One of the major purposes of the study was to discover the areas of social and civic life which seem most meaningful to the Negro youth. It was chiefly for this reason that, in the first part of the questionnaire, the subjects were given the following direction. "Suppose you had the power to change our ways of living in Miami and Dade County. State, in a sentence each, the three changes you would make first."

A tabulation of the responses indicated that the youth were quite concerned with problems dealing with education, recreation, race relations, and housing. These four areas are most frequently mentioned by both boys and girls. More than half the respondents of each sex included education as one of the three areas in which they would make changes, of one kind or another, if they were able to do so.

Areas Designated for Change by Urban Boys and Girls

AREA	BOYS		GIRLS		TOTAL	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Education	106	54	136	51	242	52
Recreation	91	46	127	47	218	47
Race Relations	86	44	131	49	217	47
Housing	73	37	113	42	186	40
Employment	36	18	64	24	100	22
Government, Politics	33	16	36	14	69	15
Transportation	31	16	26	10	57	12
Economic life	5	3	17	6	22	5
Religion	9	5	11	4	20	4
Health	7	4	10	4	17	4
Restaurants	7	4	6	2	13	3
Miscellaneous	40	20	55	20	95	21
Number of subjects	196		266		462	

* * * * *

It should be noted that, at this point in the procedure, no mention had been made to the students of segregation, discrimination, or race relations. Nevertheless, many subjects listed abolition of segregation as one of the three changes which they would like to make in our ways of living in Miami and Dade County. In some cases they stated that they would like to abolish segregation in a specific area as, "I would do away with segregation

in the schools." A greater number, however, wrote, as one of the three changes, "I would abolish segregation," or an equivalent statement, without mention of any specific area.

No change was categorized under the heading of abolition of segregation unless it was clear, without any doubt, that that was what the subject meant. For example, a number of students said that, as one of the three changes, they would make Negro schools as good as white schools. Since it was possible to interpret this to mean that the subject was satisfied with "separate but equal" facilities, this type of response was not categorized as indicating a desire to abolish segregation. This rule was rigidly enforced; it seemed wise to do so in order to be consistent and also to prevent a hypothesis of the study from becoming a bias. It is obviously possible, if not probable, that some responses which were intended to include abolition of segregation were not so interpreted because of there being some doubt as to their precise meaning.

Abolition of Segregation Listed as a Change by Urban and Rural Youth, by Sex

AREA	URBAN			RURAL		
	BOYS	GIRLS	TOTAL	BOYS	GIRLS	TOTAL
Number of subjects	196	266	462	9	26	35
Number mentioning segregation	142	184	326	1	16	17
Per cent mentioning segregation	72	69	71	11	61	49

The data showed that segregation is of considerable concern to the youth who were the subjects of the study. Segregation, in at least one area was mentioned as one of the ways of living which they would like to change by 72 per cent of the boys and 69 per cent of the girls. This supports the hypothesis of this study that problems of segregation and discrimination are important social problems to Negro youth. It also serves to refute the popular stereotype, frequently found, especially in the deep South, of the happy, carefree Negro who is contented with his lot and has no desire to mingle with white people. If, as the investigator has often been told, the Negro is "better off" under conditions of segregation these youth, at least, do not seem to realize it.

INTER-RACIAL EXPERIENCES

In Part II of the questionnaire, the students were asked to check, on the list, the three kinds of activities in which they had the most frequent contact with white persons. One of the hypotheses of the study was that the points of contact between Negro youth and white persons are concentrated within a relatively small number of areas of civic and social life. This hypothesis was strongly supported by the data from Part II. Of a total of 1,379 areas of contact checked by the urban youth, 831, or 60 per cent, are concentrated in three areas: Stores, public transportation, and employment.

**Areas of Most Frequent Inter-racial Contacts of Urban
Boys and Girls**

AREA	BOYS		GIRLS		TOTAL	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Stores	120	61	204	77	324	70
Public Transportation	117	60	196	74	313	68
Employment	110	56	84	32	194	42
Home	30	15	100	38	130	28
Communication	39	20	69	26	108	23
Recreation	39	20	29	10	68	15
(As spectator)						
Restaurants	28	14	18	7	46	10
School Activities	12	6	18	7	30	7
Recreation	27	14	7	3	34	7
(As participant)						
Church Activities	9	5	17	6	26	6
Health and Safety	11	6	18	7	29	6
Industry	11	6	5	2	16	4
Law Enforcement	9	5	9	3	18	4
Political Activities	3	2	9	3	12	3
Art, Music	2	1	8	3	10	2
Charity, Welfare	1	1	8	3	9	2
Military Activities	3	2			3	1
Miscellaneous	3	2	6	2	9	2
(Written in)						
Number of subjects	196		266		462	

In Part III of the questionnaire, the students were asked to describe the most unpleasant experience which they had ever

had involving white persons. The following table shows the areas of life in which these unpleasant experience occurred, as reported by the youth.

Areas in Which Unpleasant Experiences of Urban Boys and Girls Occurred

AREA	BOYS		GIRLS		TOTAL	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Public transportation	48	25	86	32	134	29
Stores	13	6	50	19	63	14
Employment	28	14	19	7	47	10
Recreation	13	7	10	4	23	5
Homes	8	4	11	4	19	4
On the Street	7	4	23	9	30	7
Industry, Business	4	2	6	2	10	2
Traffic	7	4	3	1	10	2
Miscellaneous	36	18	11	4	47	10
Reporting no unpleasant experience	32	16	47	18	79	17
Number of subjects	196		266		462	

As was to be expected, the unpleasant inter-racial experiences of these youth are concentrated in the same areas as are their contacts with members of the white race — stores, public trans-

Types of Unpleasant Incidents Reported by Urban Boys and Girls

TYPE OF INCIDENT	BOYS		GIRLS		TOTAL	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Overt verbal rudeness	78	40	98	37	176	38
Physical ill treatment	16	8	16	6	32	7
Non-verbal rudeness	4	2	10	4	14	3
More subtle discrimination	12	6	38	14	50	11
Exclusion	35	18	36	13	71	15
Miscellaneous	19	10	21	8	40	9
Reporting no unpleasant experience	32	16	47	18	79	17

portation, and employment. Sixty-four per cent of the unpleasant experiences of the urban youth occurred in these three areas. This suggests the possibility that, if inter-racial contacts increase in other areas, there is also likely to be an increase of experi-

Areas in Which Pleasant Experiences of Urban
Boys and Girls Occurred

AREA	BOYS		GIRLS		TOTAL	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Employment	40	20	52	20	92	20
Public Transportation	13	7	39	15	52	11
Recreation	26	13	19	7	45	10
Homes	8	4	19	7	27	6
Stores	5	2	13	5	18	4
Schools, Education	7	4	8	3	15	3
Religion	5	2	7	3	12	3
Health	1	1	6	2	7	2
Industry, Business	3	2	3	1	6	1
Art, Music	3	2	3	1	6	1
On the Street	1		5	2	6	1
Traffic	3	2	2	1	5	1
Miscellaneous	22	11	30	11	52	11
Reporting no pleasant experience	59	30	60	22	119	26
Number of subjects	196		266		462	

ences which the Negro youth regard as unpleasant. To the extent to which these unpleasant experiences arouse feelings of hostility and resentment, potentiality for emotional tension may also be expected to increase in other areas, when contacts increase.

An analysis was made of the *types* of unpleasant incidents encountered and reported by the youth. The following is a list of the categories, with a definition for each, which were used in this analysis.

Overt verbal rudeness — Name-calling, ridicule, insulting remarks, etc. The chief quality is the verbalization of rudeness.

Physical ill treatment — Violence or threats of violence: fighting, slapping, rock throwing, etc.

Non-verbal rudeness — Whispering, staring, sneers, giggling, etc. No verbalization is included.

More subtle discrimination — Pretenses used to effect discrimination. (Clerks waiting on white customers while ignoring Negro customers, implications that a Negro is "different," etc.) No direct verbalization regarding the dis-

criminatory practice or regulation. There may be some verbalization used to express the pretense under which discrimination is affected.

Exclusion — Being denied admittance or full participation because of being a Negro. (Examples: Being required to move to a back seat on a bus, not being allowed to try on clothes in a store, etc.) This may include verbalism but not rudeness.

The most frequently reported type of unpleasant incident was overt verbal rudeness — 38 per cent of the respondents reported an incident of this type. Second in order of frequency was exclusion, reported by 15 per cent of the respondents and third was more subtle discrimination, 11 per cent.

An analysis was made of the variation in types of unpleasant incidents reported by respondents of various socio-economic levels. This analysis indicated that there was a tendency for girls in the higher socio-economic levels to report more unpleasant incidents of the overt verbal type and less of the type of discrimination which was defined as exclusion. The boys showed some of this variation also, but not to so great a degree, nor so consistently as the girls. This suggests the possibility that girls in the upper levels have learned, in one way or another, what the taboos are and how to avoid them, whereas the verbal insult may be more difficult to avoid. The upper middle-class girl, for example, may have learned that she will encounter discrimination in certain places of business or recreation and may not even attempt to overcome the barrier. Under these conditions, when she was asked to recall an unpleasant inter-racial experience, she would have been less likely than the lower-class girl to recall an incident involving exclusion and may have found it necessary to report a case of verbal rudeness.

Whatever the explanation of the variation may be, it seems to be more operative among the female subjects of the study than among the males. This suggests the further possibility that, if parents of the upper levels have taught the children to avoid discrimination, the boys may have less parental supervision than the girls and may, therefore, be more venturesome in defying the barriers and taboos. The above suggestions are offered merely as hypothetical explanations of the observed phenomenon; they need further study and testing before they can be accepted as conclusions.

To provide some additional insight into the quality of the feelings of the youth, regarding their inter-racial experiences, the students were asked, on the page of the questionnaire on which they described the unpleasant incident, "About how long ago did this incident happen?". It was felt that the responses to this question would provide information regarding the nature of the experiences which made the most lasting impressions.

The data revealed a tendency for the subjects to recall and report the more direct types of discrimination — overt verbal rudeness and physical ill treatment — if they occurred a year or more previously, while they tend to report more subtle discrimination and exclusion only if they occurred more recently. This was especially true of the girls. Although these differences stood the test of statistical significance, care must be exercised in drawing conclusions from them. It would probably be erroneous to assume that the subjects are inclined to remember incidents of verbal rudeness or physical ill treatment and forget those involving exclusion or subtle discrimination, because of the statistical difference. It would probably be more reasonable to hypothesize that children do not encounter exclusion or subtle discrimination during their earlier years or do not recognize them when they do encounter them.

PLEASANT INTER-RACIAL EXPERIENCES

In Part IV of the questionnaire, the youth were asked to describe any pleasant experience which they had ever had involving white persons. This was done in order to determine the differences between the experiences which the youth report as being unpleasant and those which they consider pleasant. It was felt that a study of these responses, beside providing further insight as to the feelings of the Negro adolescents, would also furnish valuable clues as to the types of inter-racial activities which provide satisfaction to these youth and which could, therefore, be utilized in the future to improve inter-racial relations. These responses, therefore, were subjected to many of the same analyses which were used in studying the unpleasant experiences.

Probably the most significant fact revealed by the data is the close agreement between the areas in which both the pleasant and the unpleasant incidents occurred. In terms of frequency of mention, the same five areas — employment, public transportation, recreation, homes, and stores — headed both lists, although not in exactly the same order. These five areas are the ones in

which 62 per cent of the respondents reported unpleasant incidents and 51 per cent reported pleasant ones.

The students' descriptions indicated that many of the incidents involving pleasant contacts were rather trivial and superficial in nature. The concentration of a majority of the incidents, both pleasant and unpleasant, in the same five areas, suggests a possible explanation. It is possible that small courtesies or favors, or just ordinary decent treatment may stand out in some subjects' minds as a pleasant experience, largely by way of contrast. This hypothetical explanation seems to be supported by numerous statements, included in the descriptions of pleasant experiences, to the effect that the subject was glad to find that all white people are not alike or that he was pleased to find a white person who was not prejudiced. It should be pointed out that, although these incidents may seem superficial or inconsequential to a white person who has never had direct experience with the traumata which accompany segregation and discrimination, they may have had a very deep emotional meaning for these Negro youth. Many of the questionnaires, if studied intensively and in their entirety, indicate that such is probably the case.

Another observation is that a larger percentage of both boys and girls report having had no pleasant inter-racial experiences than there were of those who reported no unpleasant contacts. In other words, to the extent to which the students' responses give a true picture of the situation, unpleasant contacts with members of the white race outnumber the pleasant ones with these Negro youth.

FEELINGS AROUSED BY DISCRIMINATION

Having analyzed the experiences of the Negro youth, the study next turned its attention to the feelings which the youth said these experiences aroused. In Part III of the questionnaire, in which each subject described his unpleasant inter-racial experience, the question was asked "What did you feel like doing?"

In drawing conclusions from this portion of the study it is not possible to have complete confidence in the replies. For example, one cannot be sure that the subjects remembered the impulses which they felt when the incidents occurred, or that they would want to record them accurately if they did remember them. On the other hand, frank expression of open hostility, sometimes in violent language, in many of the responses, indicates that many

of the youth, at least, were not seriously inhibited by a reticence to record these feelings. In any event, it was felt that the responses would indicate some general trends and would thus make it possible to explore further the recorded emotions of youth which are associated with their inter-racial experiences. For example, the way in which a youth describes his feelings immediately after having written a description of an unpleasant incident may shed some light on his true feelings regarding discrimination, whether the response accurately fits his actual feelings at the time of the incident or not.

Impulses of Urban Boys and Girls to React to Discrimination

IMPULSE	BOYS		GIRLS		TOTAL	
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
To fight	95	57	73	33	168	43
To appeal to authority	3	2	7	3	10	3
To argue	25	15	49	22	74	19
To withdraw	11	7	26	12	37	10
Miscellaneous	17	10	41	19	58	15
Unable to respond	13	8	23	11	36	9
Number of subjects	164		219		383	

As is readily seen, from the above the most common impulse to discrimination, reported by the subjects, was to fight, that is, to resort to some kind of physical retaliation. It is perhaps not surprising that this impulse is more commonly reported by boys than by girls; aggressiveness on the part of boys is probably generally more in agreement with the mores than is such a reaction by girls.

An analysis of the impulses to react to discrimination, according to the socio-economic status of the respondents, indicated the tendency for both boys and girls in the upper-lower bracket to react more aggressively than those in the other brackets.

An analysis was made of the relationship between the feelings of the youth and the types of unpleasant incidents which they had experienced or the area in which they occurred. It was found that there was a highly significant relationship between the feelings of hostility and the types of unpleasant incidents. The most significant fact revealed by this analysis was the concentration of aggressive feelings in the case where the incidents involved overt verbal rudeness. These experiences frequently, al-

though not always, involved the use of the epithet "nigger". Apparently, the youth feel a considerable amount of resentment over the use of this term. It may represent a frustration of their basic need for recognition and self-respect.

A final question may be raised; are the unpleasant experiences of these youth actually examples of racial discrimination or could the discrimination have some other basis? For example, when youth reports discrimination of any type, was it because of his color or could it have been merely because he was young, or because he was poorly dressed, or because he himself was rude? It is impossible to give a definite answer to this question. However, it seems significant that, whether the discrimination is based on color or not, and whether it is real or imaginary, these Negro youth *think* the basis is color, and are likely to continue to think so as long as they live, and work, and play, and grow up in a milieu of segregation and discrimination which contains many injustices which *are* real and which are based upon racial difference. No real solution to the emotional problems of Negro youth can be hoped for until the social system is such that no one is relegated to a position of second class, or inferior, status whatever may be the basis of the discrimination.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Davis, Allison, and Dollard, John, *Children of Bondage*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1940. Pp. xxviii + 299.
- Dollard, John, and others, *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. viii + 209.
- Goff, Regina Mary, *Problems and Emotional Difficulties of Negro Children*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1949. Pp. 93.
- Johnson, Charles S., *Growing Up in the Black Belt*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1941. Pp. xxiii + 360.
- Lewin, Kurt, *Resolving Social Conflicts*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948. Pp. xviii + 230.
- Myrdal, Gunnar, *American Dilemma*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944. Pp. lix + 1483.
- Reid, Ira DeA., *In A Minor Key: Negro Youth in Story and Fact*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1940. Pp. 134.
- Sutherland, Robert L., *Color, Class and Personality*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1942. Pp. xxiii + 135.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Junker, Buford H., and Adams, Walter A., *Color and Human Nature: Negro Personality Development in a Northern City*. Washington:

Dr. Baker M. Hindman is Director of Secondary Education in Dade County, Florida.

THE TEACHER IN THE AUTHORITY SYSTEM OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL*

Howard S. Becker

Institutions can be thought of as forms of collective action which are somewhat firmly established.¹ These forms consist of the organized and related activities of several socially defined categories of people. In service institutions (like the school) the major categories of people so defined are those who do the work of the institution, its functionaries, and those for whom the work is done, its clients. These categories are often subdivided, so that there may be several categories of functionaries and several varieties of client.

One aspect of the institutional organization of activity is a division of authority, a set of shared understandings specifying the amount and kind of control each kind of person involved in the institution is to have over others: who is allowed to do what, and who may give orders to whom. This authority is subject to stresses and possible change to the degree that participants ignore the shared understandings and refuse to operate in terms of them. A chronic feature of service institutions is the indifference or ignorance of the client with regard to the authority system set up by institutional functionaries; this stems from the fact that he looks at the institution's operation from other perspectives and with other interests.² In addition to the problems of authority which arise in the internal life of any organization, the service institution's functionaries must deal with such problems in the client relationship as well. One of their preoccupations tends to be the maintenance of their authority definitions over those of clients, in order to assure a stable and congenial work setting.

This paper deals with the authority problems of the metropolitan public school teacher. I have elsewhere described the problems of the teacher in her relations with her pupils,³ and will here continue that discussion to include the teacher's relations with parents, principals, and other teachers. The following points will be considered in connection with each of these relationships: the teacher's conception of her rights and prerogatives, her problems in getting and maintaining acceptance of this conception on the part of others, and the methods used to handle such problems. The picture one should get is that of the teacher striving

to maintain what she regards as her legitimate sphere of authority in the face of possible challenge by others. This analysis of the working authority system of the public school is followed by a discussion which attempts to point up its more general relevance. The description presented here is based on sixty long and detailed interviews with teachers in the Chicago public schools.⁴

Teacher and Parent

The teacher conceives of herself as a professional with specialized training and knowledge in the field of her school activity: teaching and taking care of children. To her, the parent is a person who lacks such background and is therefore unable to understand her problems properly. Such a person, as the following quotation shows, is considered to have no legitimate right to interfere with the work of the school in any way:

One thing, I don't think a parent should try and tell you what to do in your classroom, or interfere in any way with your teaching. I don't think that's right and I would never permit it. After all, I've a special education to fit me to do what I'm doing, and a great many of them have never had any education at all, to speak of, and even if they did, they certainly haven't had my experience. So I would never let a parent interfere with my teaching.

Hers is the legitimate authority in the classroom and the parent should not interfere with it.

Problems of authority appear whenever parents challenge this conception, and are potentially present whenever parents become involved in the school's operation. They become so involved because the teacher attempts to make use of them to bolster her authority over the child, or because they become aware of some event about which they wish to complain. In either case the teacher fears a possible challenge of her basic assumption that the parent has no legitimate voice with regard to what is done to her child in school.

In the first instance, the teacher may send for the parent to secure her help in dealing with a "problem child." But this is always done with an eye to possible consequences for her authority. Thus, this expedient is avoided with parents of higher social-class position, who may not only fail to help solve the problem but may actually accuse the teacher of being the source of the problem and defend the child, thus materially weakening the teacher's power over her children:

You've got these parents who, you know, they don't think that their child could do anything wrong, can't conceive of it. If a teacher has to reprimand their child for something they're up in arms right away, it couldn't be that the child did anything wrong, it must be the teacher. So it's a lot of bother. And the children come from those kind of homes, so you can imagine that they're the same way.

The teacher feels more secure with lower-class parents, whom she considers less likely challengers. But they fail to help solve the problem, either ignoring the teacher's requests or responding in a way that increases the problem or is personally distasteful to the teacher.

[They] have a problem child, but you can't get them to school for love or money. You can send notes home, you can write letters, you can call up, but they just won't come.

If you send for [the child's] parents, they're liable to beat the child or something. I've seen a mother bring an ironing cord to school and beat her child with it, right in front of me.

And, of course, that's not what you want at all.

This tactic, then, is ordinarily dangerous in the sense that the teacher's authority may be undermined by its consequences. Where it is not dangerous, it tends to be useless for strengthening authority over the child. This reinforces the notion that the parent has no place in the school.

Parents may also become involved in the school's operation on their own initiative, when they come to complain about some action of the school's functionaries. Teachers recognize that there are kinds of activity about which parents have a legitimate right to complain, for which they may legitimately be held responsible, although the consequences of the exercise of this right are greatly feared. They recognize, that is, that the community, in giving them a mandate to teach, reserves the right to interfere when that mandate is not acted on in the "proper" manner. As Cooley put it:

The rule of public opinion, then, means for the most part a latent authority which the public will exercise when sufficiently dissatisfied with the specialist who is in charge of a particular function.⁵

Teachers fear that the exercise of this latent authority by parents will be dangerous to them.

One form of this fear is a fear that one will be held responsible for any physical harm that befalls the child:

As far as the worst thing that could happen to me here in school, I'd say it would be if something awful happened some-

place where I was supposed to be and wasn't. That would be terrible.

This, it is obvious, is more than a concern for the child's welfare. It is also a concern that the teacher not be held responsible for that welfare in such a way as to give the parents cause for complaint, as the following incident makes clear:

I've never had any trouble like that when the children were in my care. Of course, if it happens on the playground or someplace where I'm not there to watch, then it's not my responsibility, you see. . . . My children have had accidents. Last year, two of the little boys got into a fight. They were out on the playground and Ronald gave Nick a little push, you know, and one thing led to another and pretty soon Nick threw a big stone at Ronald and cut the back of his head open. It was terrible to happen, but it wasn't my fault, I wasn't out there when it happened and wasn't supposed to be. . . . Now if it had happened in my room when I was in there or should have been in there, that's different, then I would be responsible and I'd have had something to worry about. That's why I'm always careful when there's something like that might happen. For instance, when we have work with scissors I always am on my toes and keep looking over the whole room in case anything should happen like that.

Another area in which a similar fear that the parents will exercise their legitimate latent authority arises is that of teaching competence; the following incident is the kind that provokes such fears:

There was a French teacher—well, there's no question about it, the old man was senile. He was getting near retirement. I think he was sixty-four and had one year to go to retire. The parents began to complain that he couldn't teach. That was true, of course, he couldn't teach any more. He'd just get up in front of his classes and sort of mumble along. Well, the parents came to school and put so much pressure on that they had to get rid of him.

The teachers' fear in these and similar situations is that intrusion by the parents, even on legitimate grounds, will damage their authority position and make them subject to forms of control that are, for them, illegitimate—control by outsiders. This fear is greatest with higher class groups, who are considered quick to complain and challenge the school's authority. Such parents are regarded as organized and militant and, consequently, dangerous. In the lower-class school, on the other hand:

We don't have any PTA at all. You see, most of the parents

work; in most families it's both parents who work. So that there can't be much of a PTA.

These parents are not likely to interfere.

To illustrate this point, one teacher told a story of one of her pupils stabbing another with a scissors, and contrasted the reaction of the lower-class mother with that to be expected from the parents of higher status whose children she now taught:

I sure expected the Momma to show up, but she never showed. I guess the Negroes are so used to being squelched that they just take it as a matter of course, you know, and never complain about anything. Momma never showed up at all. You take a neighborhood like the one I'm teaching in now, why, my God, they'd be suing the Board of Education and me, and there'd be a court trial and everything.

It is because of dangers like this that movement to a school in such a neighborhood, desirable as it might be for other reasons, is feared.⁸

The school is for the teacher, then, a place in which the entrance of the parent on the scene is always potentially dangerous. People faced with chronic potential danger ordinarily develop some means of handling it should it become "real" rather than "potential," some kind of defense. The more elaborate defenses will be considered below. Here I want to point to the existence of devices which teachers develop or grow into which allow them some means of defense in face-to-face interaction with the parent.

These devices operate by building up in the parent's mind an image of herself and of her relation to the teacher which leads her to respect the teacher's authority and subordinate herself to it:

Quite often the offense is a matter of sassiness or back-talk. . . . So I'll explain to the parent, and tell him that the child has been sassy and disrespectful. And I ask them if they would like to be treated like that if they came to a group of children. . . . I say, "Now I can tell just by looking at you, though I've never met you before, that you're not the kind of a person who wants this child to grow up to be disrespectful like that. You want that child to grow up mannerly and polite." Well, when I put it to them that way, there's never any argument about it. . . . Of course, I don't mean that I'm not sincere when I say those things, because I most certainly am. But still, they have that effect on those people.

The danger may also be reduced when the teacher, over a period of years, grows into a kind of relationship with the par-

ents of the community which minimizes the possibilities of conflict and challenge:

If you have a teacher who's been in a school twenty years, say, why she's known in that community. Like as not she's had some of the parents as pupils. They know her and they are more willing to help her in handling the children than if they didn't know who she was.

If the teacher works in the same neighborhood that she lives in she may acquire a similar advantage, although there is some evidence that the degree of advantage is a function of the teacher's age. Where she is a middle-aged woman whose neighborhood social life is carried on those women of similar age who are the parents of her pupils, the relationship gives her a distinct advantage in dealing with those same women in the school situation. If, however, she is a younger woman, parents are likely to regard her as "a kid from the neighborhood" and treat her accordingly, and the danger of her authority being successfully challenged is that much greater.

In short, the teacher wishes to avoid any dispute over her authority with parents and feels that this can be accomplished best when the parent does not get involved in the school's operation any more than absolutely necessary. The devices described are used to handle the "parent problem" when it arises, but none of them are foolproof and every teacher is aware of the ever-present possibility of a parent intruding and endangering her authority. This constant danger creates a need for defenses and the relations of teacher and principal and of teachers to one another are shaped by this need. The internal organization of the school may be seen as a system of defenses against parental intrusion.

Teacher and Principal

The principal is accepted as the supreme authority in the school:

After all, he's the principal, he is the boss, what he says should go, you know what I mean. . . . He's the principal and he's the authority, and you have to follow his orders. That's all there is to it.

This is true no matter how poorly he fills the position. The office contains the authority, which is legitimated in terms of the same principles of professional education and experience which the teacher uses to legitimate her authority over parents.

But this acceptance of superiority has limits. Teachers have a well-developed conception of just how and toward what ends the principal's authority should be used, and conflict arises when it is used without regard for the teachers' expectations. These expectations are especially clear with regard to the teacher's relationships with parents and pupils, where the principal is expected to act to uphold the teacher's authority regardless of circumstances. Failure to do this produces dissatisfaction and conflict, for such action by the principal is considered one of the most efficient defenses against attack on authority, whether from parents or pupils.

The principal is expected to "back the teacher up"—support her authority—in all cases of parental "interference." This is, for teachers, one of the major criteria of a "good" principal. In this next quotation the teacher reacts to the failure of a principal to provide this:

That's another thing the teachers have against her. She really can't be counted on to back you up against a child or a parent. She got one of our teachers most irate with her, and I can't say I blame her. The child was being very difficult and it ended up with a conference with the parent, principal, and teacher. And the principal had the nerve to say to the parent that she couldn't understand the difficulty, none of the other teachers who had the child had ever had any trouble. Well, that was nothing but a damn lie, if you'll excuse me. . . . And everybody knew it was a lie. . . . And the principal knew it too, she must have. And yet she had the nerve to stand there and say that in front of the teacher and the parent. She should never have done that at all, even if it was true she shouldn't have said it. [Interviewer: What was the right thing to do?] Well, naturally, what she should have done is to stand behind the teacher all the way. Otherwise, the teacher loses face with the kids and with the parents and that makes it harder for her to keep order or anything from then on.

This necessity for support is independent of the legitimacy of the teacher's action; she can be punished later, but without parents knowing about it. And the principal should use any means necessary to preserve authority, lying himself or supporting the teacher's lies:

You could always count on him to back you up. If a parent came to school hollering that a teacher had struck her child, Mr. D—— would handle it. He'd say, "Why, Mrs. So-an-So, I'm sure you must be mistaken. I can't believe that any of our teachers would do a thing like that. Of course, I'll look into

the matter and do what's necessary but I'm sure you've made a mistake. You know how children are." And he'd go on like that until he had talked them out of the whole thing.

Of course the teacher would certainly catch it later. He'd call them down to the office and really give them a tongue lashing that they wouldn't forget. But he never failed them when it came to parents.

Not all principals live up to this expectation. Their failure to support the teacher is attributed to cowardice, "liberalism," or an unfortunate ability to see both sides of a question. The withholding of support may also, however, be a deliberate gesture of disapproval and punishment. This undermining of the teacher's authority is one of the most extreme and effective sanctions at the principal's command:

[The teacher had started a class project in which the class, boys and girls, made towels to be given to the parents as Christmas presents.] We were quite well along in our project when in walked this principal one day. And did she give it to me! Boy! She wanted to know what the idea was. I told her it was our Christmas project and that I didn't see anything the matter with it. Well, she fussed and fumed. Finally, she said, "Alright, you may continue. But I warn you if there are any complaints by fathers to the Board downtown about one of our teachers making sissies out of their boys you will have to take the full responsibility for it. I'm not going to take any responsibility for this kind of thing." And out she marched.

Teachers expect the same kind of support and defense in their dealings with pupils, again without regard for the justice of any particular student complaint. If the students find the principal a friendly court of appeal, it is much harder for the teacher to maintain control over them.⁷

The amount of threat to authority, in the form of challenges to classroom control, appears to teachers to be directly related to the principal's strictness. Where he fails to act impressively "tough" the school has a restless atmosphere and control over pupils is difficult to attain. The opposite is true where the children know that the principal will support any action of a teacher.

The children are scared to death of her [the principal]. All she has to do is walk down the hall and let the children hear her footsteps and right away the children would perk up and get very attentive. They're really afraid of her. But it's better that way than the other.

Such a principal can materially minimize the discipline problem,

and is especially prized in the lower-class school, where this problem is greatest.

The principal provides this solid underpinning for the teachers' authority over pupils by daily acts of "toughness", daily reaffirmations of his intention to keep the children "in line." The following quotation contrasts successful and unsuccessful principal activity in this area:

For instance, let's take a case where a teacher sends a pupil down to the office. . . . When you send a child down to this new principal, he goes down there and he sits on the bench there. . . . Pretty soon, the clerk needs a messenger and she sees this boy sitting there. Well, she sends him running all over the school. That's no punishment as far as he's concerned. Not at all.

The old principal didn't do things that way. If a child was sent down to the office he knew he was in for a rough time and he didn't like it much. Mr. G—— would walk out of his office and look over the children sitting on the bench and I mean he'd look right through them, each one of them. You could just see them shiver when he looked at them. Then he'd walk back in the office and they could see him going over papers, writing. Then, he'd send for them, one at a time. And he'd give them a lecture, a real lecture. Then he'd give them some punishment, like writing an essay on good manners and memorizing it so they could come and recite it to him the next day by heart. Well, that was effective. They didn't like being sent to Mr G——. When you sent someone there that was the end of it. They didn't relish the idea of going there another time. That's the kind of backing up a teacher likes to feel she can count on.

The principal is expected to support all teachers in this way, even the chronic complainers who do not deserve it:

If the principal's any good he knows that the complaints of a woman like that don't mean anything but he's got to back her just the same. But he knows that when a teacher is down complaining about students twice a week that there's nothing the matter with the students, there's something the matter with her. And he knows that if a teacher comes down once a semester with a student that the kid has probably committed a real crime, really done something bad. And his punishments will vary accordingly.

The teacher's authority, then, is subject to attack by pupils and may be strengthened or weakened depending on which way the principal throws the weight of his authority. Teachers expect the

principal to throw it their way, and provide them with a needed defense.

The need for recognition of their independent professional authority informs teachers' conceptions of the principal's supervisory role. It is legitimate for him to give professional criticism, but only in a way that preserves this professional authority. He should give "constructive" rather than "arbitrary" orders, "ask" rather than "snoop." It is the infringement of authority that is the real distinction in these pairs of terms. For example:

You see, a principal ought to give you good supervision. He ought to go around and visit his teachers and see how they're doing—come and sit in the room awhile and then if he has any constructive criticism to make, speak to the teacher about it privately later. Not this nagging bitching that some of them go in for, you know what I mean, but real constructive criticism.

But I've seen some of those bastards that would go so far as to really bawl someone out in public. Now that's a terrible thing to do. They don't care who it's in front of, either. It might be a parent, or it might be other teachers, or it might even be the kids. That's terrible, but they actually do it.

Conflict arises when the principal ignores his teachers' need for professional independence and defense against attacks on authority. Both principal and teachers command sanctions which may be used to win such a conflict and establish their definition of the situation: i.e., they have available means for controlling each other's behavior. The principal has, as noted above, the powerful weapon of refusing to support the teacher in crucial situations; but this has the drawback of antagonizing other teachers and, also, is not available to a principal whose trouble with teachers stems from his initial failure to do this.

The principal's administrative functions provide him with his most commonly used sanctions. As administrator he allocates extra work of various kinds, equipment, rooms, and (in the elementary school) pupils to his teachers. In each category, some things are desired by teachers while others are disliked—some rooms are better than others, some equipment newer, etc. By distributing the desired things to a given teacher's disadvantage, the principal can effectively discipline her. A subtle use of such sanctions is seen in this statement:

Teacher: That woman really used to run the school, too. You had to do just what she said.

Interviewer: What did she do if you "disobeyed?"

Teacher: There were lots of things she could do. She had charge of assigning children to their new rooms when they passed. If she didn't like you she could really make it tough for you. You'd get all the slow children and all the behavior problems the dregs of the school. After six months of that you'd really know what work meant. She had methods like that.

Such sanctions are ineffective against those few teachers who are either eccentric or determined enough to ignore them. They may also fail in lower-class schools where the teacher does not intend to stay.⁸

The sanctions teachers can apply to a principal who respect or protect their authority are somewhat less direct. They may just ignore him: "After all if the principal gets to be too big a bother, all you have to do is walk in your room and shut the door, and he can't bother you." Another weapon is hardly a weapon at all—making use of the power to request transfer to another school in the system. It achieves its force when many teachers use it, presumably causing higher authorities to question the principal's ability:

I know of one instance, a principal of that type, practically every teacher in her school asked to leave. Well, you might think that was because of a group that just didn't get along with the new principal. But when three or four sets of teachers go through a school like that, then you know something's wrong.

Finally, the teachers may collectively agree on a line of passive resistance, and just do things their way, without any reference to the principal's desires.

In some cases of extreme conflict, the teachers (some of whom may have been located in the school for a longer period than the principal) may use their connections in the community to create sentiment against the principal. Cooperative action of parents and teachers directed toward the principal's superiors is the teachers' ultimate sanction.

The principal, then, is expected to provide a defense against parental interference and student revolt, by supporting and protecting the teacher whenever her authority is challenged. He is expected, in his supervisory role, to respect the teacher's independence. When he does not do these things a conflict may arise. Both parties to the conflict have at their disposal effective means of controlling the other's behavior, so that the ordinary situation

is one of compromise (if there is a dispute at all), with sanctions being used only when the agreed-on boundaries are overstepped.

Colleague Relations

It is considered that teachers ought to cooperate to defend themselves against authority attacks and to refrain from directly endangering the authority of another teacher. Teachers, like other work groups, develop a sense that they share a similar position and common dangers, and this provides them with a feeling of collegueship that makes them amenable to influence in these directions by fellow teachers.

Challenging of another teacher so as to diminish her authority is the basic crime:

For one thing, you must never question another teacher's grade, no matter if you know it's unjustified. That just wouldn't do. There are some teachers that mark unfairly. A girl, or say a boy, will have a four "S" report book and this woman will mark it a "G". . . . Well, I hate to see them get a deal like that, but there's nothing you can do.

Another teacher put it more generally: "For one thing, no teacher should ever disagree with another teacher or contradict her, in front of a pupil." The result in terms of authority vis-a-vis students is feared: "Just let another teacher raise her eyebrow funny, just so they [the children] know, and they don't miss a thing, and their respect for you goes down right away." With regard to authority threats by parents it is felt that teachers should not try to cast responsibility for actions which may provoke parental interference on another teacher.

Since teachers work in separate rooms and deal with their own groups of parents and pupils, it is hard for another teacher to get the opportunity to break these rules, even if she were so inclined. This difficulty is increased by an informal rule against entering another teacher's room while she is teaching. Breaches of these rules are rare and, when do they occur, are usually a kind of punishment aimed at a colleague disliked for exceeding the group work quotas or for more personal reasons. However, the danger inherent in such an action—that it may affect your own authority in some way or be employed against you—is so feared that it is seldom used.

In short, teachers can depend on each other to "act right" in authority situations, because of colleague feeling, lack of opportunity to act "wrong," and fear of the consequences of such action.

Discussion

I have presented the teacher as a person who is concerned (among other things) with maintaining what she considers to be her legitimate authority over pupils and parents, with avoiding and defending against challenges from these sources. In her view, the principal and other teachers should help her in building a system of defenses against such challenges. Through feelings of collegueship and the use of various kinds of sanctions, a system of defenses and secrecy (oriented toward preventing the intrusion of parents and children into the authority system) is organized.

This picture discloses certain points of general relevance for the study of institutional authority systems. In the first place, an institution like the school can be seen as a small, self-contained system of social control. Its functionaries (principal and teachers) are able to control one another; each has some power to influence the others' conduct. This creates a stable and predictable work setting, in which the limits of behavior for every individual are known, and in which one can build a satisfactory authority position of which he can be sure, knowing that he has certain methods of controlling those who ignore his authority.

In contrast the activities of those who are outside the professional group are not involved in such a network of mutual unvalues by which the teacher legitimates her authority. And while parents can apply sanctions to the teacher, the teacher has no means of control which she can use in return, in direct retaliation.

To the teacher, then, the parent appears as an unpredictable and uncontrollable element, as a force which endangers and may even destroy the existing authority system over which she has some measure of control. For this reason, teachers (and principals who abide by their expectations) carry on an essentially secretive relationship vis-a-vis parents and the community, trying to prevent any event which will give these groups a permanent place of authority in the school situation. The emphasis on never admitting mistakes of school personnel to parents is an attempt to prevent these outsiders (who would not be subject to teacher control) from getting any excuse which might justify their intrusion into and possible destruction of the existing authority system.

This suggests the general proposition that the relations of institutional functionaries to one another are relations of mutual influence and control, and that outsiders are systematically prevented from exerting any authority over the institution's operations because they are not involved in this web of control and would literally be uncontrollable, and destructive of the institutional organization, as the functionaries desire it to be preserved, if they were allowed such authority.⁹

* This paper is based on research done under a grant from the Committee on Education, Training, and Research in Race Relations of the University of Chicago.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Cf. E. C. Hughes, "The Study of Institutions," *Social Forces*, XX (March, 1942), 307-10.

² See my earlier statement in "The Professional Dance Musician and His Audience," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVII (Sept., 1951), 136-144.

³ Howard S. Becker, "Social-Class Variations in the Teacher-Pupil Relationship," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, XXV (April, 1952), 451-465.

⁴ Details of method are reported in Howard S. Becker, "Role and Career Problems of the Chicago Public School Teacher," (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1951).

⁵ Charles Horton Cooley, *Social Organization* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), p. 131.

⁶ See Howard S. Becker, "The Career of the Chicago Public School Teacher," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVII (March, 1952), 475.

⁷ Cf. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, trans. Kurt Wolff (Glencoe: Free Press, 1950), p. 235: "The position of the subordinate in regard to his superordinate is favorable if the latter, in his turn, is subordinate to a still higher authority in which the former finds support."

⁸ See Becker, "The Career of the Chicago Public School Teacher," *op. cit.*, 472-3.

⁹ Cf. Max Weber: "Bureaucratic administration always tends to be an administration of 'secret sessions': in so far as it can, it hides its knowledge and action from criticism. . . . the tendency toward secrecy in certain administrative fields follows their material nature: everywhere that the power interests of the domination structure toward *the outside* are at stake . . . we find secrecy." In H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 233.

Dr. Howard S. Becker is in the department of Sociology at the University of Chicago.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Church and Social Responsibility, by J. Richard Spann, editor. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953 Pp. 271

For Christians seeking to translate their faith into action, "The Church and Social Responsibility" provides a stimulating analyses of problems of human relations in our world today, each followed by recommendations for ways and means to tackle the problems. It rings certain bells which must be heard before Christians will begin to act upon their faith.

However, as a cultural bridge builder and as a guide to the improvement of human relations on the local scene as well as on the international scene, the book leaves much to be offered the reader. For example, the problem of an operative conception of community for others than Christians is confused as they read that "the new community is formed by the forgiveness of sins or deliverance of sin and death, or reconciliation with God, by the new life in Christ and with one another."¹ While the author fits this concept of "community" into a broader concept of community-at-large, there is a question as to its adequacy for those Christians who devote their talent and time, in a democratic society, to broader social problems which know no barrier of religious belief or political ideology.

Another reason for the concern raised in the second paragraph of this review is the lack of joint or inclusive agency approach to social problems in the community. (That process of inclusive community approach which utilizes all of the human factors and forces within the community in the selection of problems and in the plan and design for their solution.) This lack is evidenced most sharply in: (1) the conception of the church in its relation to existing agencies which work for similar goals. This relationship is clearly set forth when the author states that in appraising the adequacy of organizations already at work on social problems the church has a two-fold concern "first, to inspire and support existing agencies which, though not operating under church auspices, are in reality its extended helping hand;"² this does not, in the mind of the reviewer, suggest a relationship with other agencies which will secure the maximum amount of cooperation in the adjustment and alleviation of social problems. (2) Again the function of judgment is retained entirely by the church according to the following statement: "... by se-

¹p. 42, 51.

²p. 242.

lecting those objectives and activities which look toward the growth of community in human relations, the church renders its judgment upon them. It states what it can approve and encourage. It leaves out what has no potentiality for advance toward the kingdom."³ Again the role of the church as a judge is indicated "... it (the church) will review the conduct of the agencies, the manner of their administration, the standards employed, the adequacy of the services themselves at the point of actual contact with need."⁴ While the churches have a cooperative role to play, the above quotations seem to reserve an unusually large amount of judgment for that organization which itself, by its own admission, is in need of more serious judgment. (3) This lack of an inclusive agency approach to community social problems is further shown by the strong negative feeling evidenced by the author of this chapter toward social science in general. The author distinguishes between the values of social science and the technical equipment "for our task." He makes it clear however that "our concern and function cannot be identified with them."⁵ In speaking of the functions of social science as being descriptive and statistical and concerning themselves with presenting "the facts about social changes which have already taken place"⁶, the author has neglected any predictive roles which evolve from valid and adequate social research.

One could hope that such treatment of the churches' responsibility in the area of social problems would deal more adequately with the rooting of human freedoms in human nature; it seems insufficient to explain away peremptorily this human dynamic by saying simply "they (human freedoms) tend to become purely relative and conventional, and the way is open for might to replace right."⁷

As an alternative to an association with social scientists the author of this chapter then proposes the occupational of the 'social evangelists! It seems that, "descriptive sociology has no power to institute change," and since "as evangelists, our task is to project goals for change, decide what direction this change should take, and set about bringing it to pass", then, presto it is clear — all that is needed is a 'social evangelist'. This is the name given to a new occupational 'profession'. It appears to be designed in order to add the respect-

³p. 243.

⁴p. 243.

⁵p. 249.

⁶p. 249.

⁷p. 22

ability of social science and lend some much needed authority to the evangelist. A good deal is said about what the 'social evangelist' ought to do, but virtually nothing about his equipment other than that good precedents have been set by evangelists who have never benefited from scientific sociology and who actually began their careers and acquired their social awareness as pastors. In some unclear fashion then the social evangelist should formulate his occupational role and proceed to usher in the kingdom of God intuitively using the 'arms' (helping hands) which are supplied in our present society.

A thoughtful reading of this book will convince one that some very serious questions must be faced by those who hold one particular view of, and solution to, the social problems which confront the world today. It seems rather clear that the metaphysics of a single religion as implied here will not be sufficient to permit that religion to be a true cultural bridge builder on an international scale. This, of course, does not preclude the possibility of the integrative role that might be played within the psychological grouping comprised of its adherents.

ALFRED KRAMER
Race Relations Division,
National Council of Churches of
Christ in America.